



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Indogermanische Grammatiken. Band IV. B. DELBRÜCK, Einleitung in das Sprachstudium. 2te Auflage. Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1884.

Many students in this country, as well as abroad, who have felt the value of Prof. Delbrück's useful and suggestive little summary, will experience a feeling of disappointment on reading in his preface to the new edition that, owing to an accident, he did not learn the necessity of a second edition until too late to carry out his original plan, which was to extend the historical portion of the work (this would have been especially desirable in the chapter on "Neue Bestrebungen") so as to obtain a background better adapted to set off the achievements of such masters as Bopp and Grimm. The second essentially subjective portion of the book it was also his design to partially remodel; but this intention, like the other, could not be carried into execution, and he had only time to revise the whole, with here and there a slight addition. The principal amendments (most of them indicated in the preface) are the following:

On pp. 53-54 we miss the picturesque statement that Schleicher must have viewed the proceedings of the anatomist through philological spectacles, and find instead a eulogy of the methods pursued and services rendered by this eminent investigator. Ascoli also comes in for his share of praise on p. 58, and in a note on p. 122 his *Lettera glottologica* of 1881 is discussed, in which it is claimed that the variety of development attained by the I. E. languages in the course of time (such, for instance, as the change of the Latin *ū* to *ū* on Gallo-Romanic ground) is due to the "Kreuzung der Völker." Delbrück is inclined to think that this theory claims too much, since, for example, we meet with the change of *ū* to *ū* on Slavonic ground, where no Keltic intermixture can exist; yet he admits that this idea must not be lost sight of in our historical investigation of forms, and is led in this connection to speak of the sentence-accent, so frequently a distinguishing characteristic among the German dialects, yet which has never yet been utilized in drawing the boundaries between them.

In his preface to the English translation, Prof. Delbrück expressed the hope that in a second edition he might be able to discuss his disagreement with Sayce's views; we find nothing, however, in the present volume, except a note on p. 70, stating that the Englishman agrees, in the main, with Ludwig's "Adaptation theory," after revoking an earlier opinion very similar to Bopp's, with regard to the personal endings of the verb.

Perhaps the most important alteration in the book is in the passage on pp. 118-119, where the question is discussed whether the law of economy is to be regarded as the only principle in phonetic change. In consideration of Prof. Whitney's remarks in the Proceedings of the Am. Phil. Assoc. for July, 1882, the theory of the latter is presented by Prof. Delbrück with more fulness and accuracy than before, and he admits that the tendency to ease plays "eine ganz hervorragende Rolle" in the life of language. He does not, however, content himself with acknowledging (with Whitney) the *a priori* possibility of the existence of other factors yet to be discovered; ignoring Whitney's objection that there can be no conscious "striving" in the case, he still advocates the plausibility of an "aesthetic" impulse, as brought forward in the first edition. This he further elaborates by the example of the fashionable habit,

prevailing among the German military, of speaking through the nose, and the experience of Kempelen regarding the favorite pronunciation of *r* in Paris. He seems to lose sight of the fact that such arbitrary proceedings (in so far as they *are* arbitrary, and do not rest, on the one hand, on physical grounds, and, on the other hand, on an unconscious imitation of the pronunciation of one's fellows) have no more to do with the natural life and growth of language than an edict of government which (if we can imagine it) should forbid the utterance of the vowel *a* within a given community.

There is little else to record in the way of addition or improvement. Rather interesting is the opinion, expressed in a sentence at the end of the chapter on the agglutination theory, that if the attempt (to analyze I. E. inflectional forms) is ever to be more successful than at present, "so wird das jedenfalls nur mit reichlicher Benutzung der ausserindogermanischen Sprachwelt möglich sein." In the chapter on the Separation of the Races, the views of Johannes Schmidt are presented somewhat more in detail, especially in their relation to those of Leskien. To the whole a brief conclusion is appended, which is summed up in the remark, already uttered in the preface to the English translation, "Die Sprachwissenschaft ist aus der philosophischen in die historische Periode eingetreten."

E. CHANNING.

De Theatro Attico saeculi ante Christum quinti. Dissertatio philologa.
JULIUS HÖPKEN. Bonnae, 1884.

Philologie. Ueber das griechische und römische Theater, von Dr. J. HÖPKEN.

These two, the former a graduating thesis, the latter a more popular restatement of the same, may be noticed together. The points which Dr. Höpken desires to establish are, as it will be seen, decidedly revolutionary. To any one who has been a pleased and confiding spectator at recent representations of Greek plays—as, for example, the excellent and justly praised production of the *Œdipus Tyrannus*, at Cassel, in 1879, or the more elaborate representation of the same play at Harvard in 1881—it will be perhaps somewhat startling to be told that learned professors have been in error, not in details simply, but in regard to the most important relations between chorus and actors. Yet, improbable as it may be that the true explanation should so long have been delayed, one must be only too glad of any additional light upon difficulties and contradictions in the account of the construction of the theatre heretofore accepted.

Dr. Höpken claims that the Attic theatre of the 5th century B. C. differed from the Roman theatres and others of a later date more than the plans in the books indicate.

As is well known, the *cavea* or *θέατρον* proper (see fig. RRR) was curtailed in the Roman theatre to a semicircle; the front of the *proscenium* (in the extended sense) was the whole diameter of this circle, and consequently this space was sufficiently large for a stage when a chorus was no longer to be provided for. In the 5th century theatre, on the other hand, the whole